



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,466	07/18/2003	Gary S. Dixon	OST101 (976626-100/001)	2973
29484	7590	05/24/2010	EXAMINER	
PATENTMETRIX 14252 CULVER DR. BOX 914 IRVINE, CA 92604			CHENG, JACQUELINE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

hazim@patentmetrix.com
sona@patentmetrix.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/623,466	Applicant(s) DIXON ET AL.	
	Examiner JACQUELINE CHENG	Art Unit 3768	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 1, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments that Lang (US 7,184,814) does not disclose the invention as claimed. Lang fulfills the claim limitations as when each of the tests are done (T-score, gait, biomarker) and when each of the results is abnormal, all of the tests have been done. So although Lang does not fulfill the condition of not performing the bone marker test when the gait characterization is normal, Lang does fulfill a condition of if, or only if the gait characterization is abnormal the biomarker test is done. Furthermore the applicant does not have support for the phrase "only if". It is for these reasons that the previous rejection dated December 1, 2009 still stands and is repeated below with the new matter rejection for the amendment of "only if". The applicant has overcome the previous claim objection of claim 57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claim 44** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that

Art Unit: 3768

the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Nowhere in the specification was there found support for the phrase “only if”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 44-47, 51-59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang’208 (US 2003/0015208 A1) in view of Faulkner (US 6,740,041 B2) further in view of Lang’814 (US 7,184,814 B2).

6. Lang’208 discloses a method of diagnosing bone related diseases where using a combination of several independent measurements or tests provides for greater diagnostic power. One of the measurements is a bone characteristic level such as bone mineral density (paragraph 0030) taken using systems such as X-ray, ultrasound, MRI or CT (paragraph 0027). Lang’208 does not explicitly disclose using a T-score as a measure of the bone mineral density, however it is well known in the art as disclosed by Faulkner that a raw bone mineral density value has limited meaning to a physician (col. 1 line 27-35) so it is obvious to provide an established reference such as a T-score to make the raw bone mineral density value of Lang’208 useful.

7. Another one of the measurements that Lang’208 discloses is determining a movement pattern of the joint (paragraph 0047). Lang’208 does not explicitly disclose how movement pattern of a joint is determined so it would be obvious to use a well known method of

Art Unit: 3768

determining movement pattern of a joint such as disclosed by Lang'814 (col. 13 line 24-28).

Lang'814 discloses determining a movement pattern comprises obtaining an external image of the joint such as performing gait analyses including static loading alignments or force plates for measurement of foot-ground reaction forces (col. 31 line 48-67, col. 32 line 30-47).

8. A third measurement that Lang'208 discloses is measurement of biomarkers. The biomarkers of a bone marker concentration can be taken from a body fluid such as urine to identify bone resorption levels (paragraphs 0026). It is inherent that to measure the bone marker level in a body fluid, the body fluid must be put in a container to be analyzed and to obtain the bone marker level an output must be outputted.

9. Depending on the results of the combination of these tests using a mathematical function, a disease is assessed and a therapy such as a postponement of development of bone loss symptom can be prescribed such as taking a calcium supplement (paragraph 0023, 0069, 0072). Further repeat measurements can then be taken over a period of time, which can be seconds, minutes, hours, days, months, or any interval there between to follow up on the therapy (such every month for 8 months which would result in a series of eight gait analyses) (paragraph 0067).

10. **Claims 48-50, 52** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang'208 in view of Faulkner in view of Lang'814, and further in view of Chaintreuil (US 6,234,969 B1). Chaintreuil discloses a bone densitometer having a housing for a foot in which a pair of ultrasonic transducers engages the heel at a controlled pressure. The ultrasonic waves that are detected are the used to calculate an quantitative ultrasound index, or a stiffness value (fig. 1,

Art Unit: 3768

col. 4 line 14-61). It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Chaintreuil with Lang'208 as Lang'208 discloses using ultrasound measurements for the imaging test.

11. **Claim 60 and 61** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang'208 in view of Faulkner in view of Lang'814, and further in view of Pratt (US 4,195,643). Lang'814 does not explicitly disclose the method of performing the gait analysis, but does disclose that the analysis can be done with loading alignments and force plates (col. 31 line 48-67, col. 32 line 30-47). It would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art to use any well known measuring and characterizing of gait, in particular one that uses force plates such as disclosed by Pratt. Pratt discloses to measure and characterize gait a person stands on a dual force plate system which determines the force exerted by the right foot and the left foot. These forces can be compared to determine a difference in the forces exerted by each foot, and determine balance forces of the subject (col. 5 line 61-col. 6 line 14, fig. 3). Balance forces of a subject can also be measured with one foot off the ground (col. 9 line 62-65).

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3768

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JACQUELINE CHENG whose telephone number is (571)272-5596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jacqueline Cheng/
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768